

REMARKS

Claims 6-9, 11, 12 and 24-46 were pending in the above-identified application. Claims 27-32, 38-43, and 46 were rejected, claims 1-5, 10, and 13-23 were previously cancelled, and claims 6-9, 11, 12, 24-26, 33-37, 44, and 45 were previously withdrawn. With this Amendment, claims 27 and 41 are amended, and claims 28 and 42 are cancelled. Accordingly, claims 6-9, 11, 12, 24-27, 29-41, and 43-46 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 27, 28, and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Takaaki* (JP Patent Publ. No. 2002-131750) in view of *Kikkawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,032).

Claims 38, 39, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Takaaki* and *Kikkawa* in view of *Hanrahan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,788).

Claims 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Takaaki* and *Kikkawa* in view of *Suzuki et al.* (U.S. Patent Publ. No. 2002/0018162).

Claims 30, 32, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Takaaki* and *Kikkawa* in view of *Suzuki et al.* and in view of *Nishida et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,168).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 27 is directed to a liquid crystal display device. The liquid crystal display device includes a microlens, a liquid crystal panel, a first optical compensation layer, and a second optical compensation layer. Claim 27 recites that “each of the first and second optical compensation layers [are] made of an inorganic material, formed in a flat plate-like shape, and [have] an optical axis inclined with respect to a surface of the liquid crystal panel.” Independent claim 41 recites similar limitations.

Claims 27 and 41 have been amended to recite that “the first optical compensation layer [is] positioned on a luminous flux emission side of the liquid crystal panel, and the second optical compensation layer [is] positioned on the luminous flux incidence side of the liquid crystal panel.”

All of the rejections principally rely on the *Takaaki* reference. *Takaaki* is directed to a projection display. *Takaaki* discloses the use of an optical phase compensation board to compensate for the optical phase difference. As noted by the Examiner, the optical phase compensation board disclosed in *Takaaki* includes optical phase compensation films 85, 86. These optical phase compensation films 85, 86 are laminated on top of each other and are present on the incident side of the display panel (Fig. 2).

While Applicants do not agree with the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 27 and 41 to recite that “the first optical compensation layer [is] positioned on a luminous flux emission side of the liquid crystal panel, and the second optical compensation layer [is] positioned on the luminous flux incidence side of the liquid crystal panel.” Unlike the claimed invention, *Takaaki* clearly does not disclose this limitation, and neither do the other references cited by the Examiner for a specific purpose.

In particular, *Takaaki* does not disclose or suggest that the first optical compensation layer is positioned on the luminous flux emission side of the liquid crystal panel, and the second optical compensation layer is positioned on the luminous flux incidence side of the liquid crystal panel, as recited in amended claims 27 and 41. Rather, *Takaaki* merely discloses optical compensation films 85, 86 that are laminated on top of each other, and that are positioned on the incident side of the display panel.

Further, claims 27 and 41 recite that the “optical compensation layers [are] made of an inorganic material.” Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion that *Takaaki* discloses this element, *Tanaka* appears to disclose that the optical phase compensation films are made of triacetyl cellulose (TAC), an organic material (see par. [0093]).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 27 and 41, and their respective dependent claims, are not rendered obvious by *Takaaki* in view of *Kikkawa* or any other cited art.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 17, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000